

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are all the claims pending in the application. By this amendment, Applicants are amending claims 1 and 2 to recite that the positioning member *continuously surrounds* the core wire.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the recited “positioning member” is not described in the original specification.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the recited “positioning member” is not described in the original specification.

As discussed in the response filed May 20, 2005, Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 in view of the fact that original specification provides support for the recited “positioning member.” Specifically, the specification states that the “core wire guide portion 20a is formed to produce a clearance between the deepest portion 20a-1 thereof.”¹ Accordingly, the core wire guide portion 20a is an *exemplary* embodiment of the recited positioning member monolithically formed with the main body.

¹ See page 7, lines 24-25 & FIG. 1 of the original specification.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1-5, 7, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Borsuk et al. (4,666,238). Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borsuk et al. (4,666,238).

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection at least because Borsuk does not teach or suggest all of the claims' recitations. For example, Borsuk does not teach or suggest the claimed ferrule having a main body formed with a hole into which a core wire of the optical fiber is inserted, a positioning member monolithically formed with the main body, and a leading end portion monolithically formed with the main body, in which *the positioning member continuously surrounds the core wire*.

In the Response dated May 20, 2005, Applicant argued that Borsuk's retention devices 10, 70, 100, 200, 10'" cannot correspond to a "ferrule" because the retention devices are not shaped as a ring or a cap. However, the Examiner was not convinced by this argument.²

Interview

Accordingly, Applicant's representative contact Examiner Than Lee on June 7, 2005 to discuss this rejection. Specifically, Applicant's representative mentioned amending independent claims 1 and 1 to recite that the "positioning member continuously surrounds the core wire" as a way to overcome the rejection in view of Borsuk. The Examiner indicated that the rejection in view of Borsuk should be overcome if Applicant amends the claim in this way.

² See Advisory Action dated May 31, 2005.

That is, Applicant respectfully submits that none of Borsuk's retention devices 10, 70, 100, 200, 10''' can reasonably correspond to the recite ferrule because they do not include a positioning member that continuously surrounds the core wire. Instead, as shown in Figs. 5-9A of Borsuk, although each the various retention devices include an indentation (e.g., groove 18) for the optical fiber 34, these indentations cannot correspond to a positioning member that continuously surrounds the core wire. For example, the retention device 100 of Fig. 8 includes cutaways 106.

Accordingly, Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is patentable at least for the reasons discussed above.

Moreover, with respect to the rejection of independent claim 2, Borsuk does not teach or suggest the claimed ferrule having a main body formed with a hole into which a core wire of the optical fiber is inserted and a positioning member monolithically formed with the main body, in which *the positioning member continuously surrounds the core wire*.

As discussed above, none of the various embodiments of Borsuk's monolithic retention devices 70, 100, 200, 10''' could reasonably be considered the claimed *ferrule*.

Applicant also respectfully submits that dependent claims 3-10 are patentable at least because of their dependency from one of claims 1 and 2.

Conclusion


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Appln. No. 10/705,233

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


John M. Bird
Registration No. 46,027

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 21, 2005

Attorney Docket No.: Q78419